UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,913	09/29/2005	Andrea Venturelli	5659	5133
	7590 05/12/200 AND MATTARE, LT		EXAMINER	
10 POST OFFI	CE ROAD - SUITE 10		MCEVOY, THOMAS M	
SILVER SPRIN	NG, IMD 20910		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3731	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/538,913	VENTURELLI, ANDREA		
Examiner	Art Unit		
THOMAS MCEVOY	3731		

	THOWAS WICEVOT	3/31	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater thán SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE r).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in compl	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying the	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reju	solod ciairrio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant / inchament (1 102 024).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii odbiiiittod iii a ooparate,	amery med ameriamer	it dandeling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	LL NOT ! " " "	110 m ··	
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the extraphed Information Displaceurs Statement(s). 		n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	F 1 0/3 b/00) Paper 190(\$)		
/Anhtuan T. Nguyen/	/Thomas Mcevoy/		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731	Examiner, Art Unit 3731		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner believes Dang suggests that the length of the tie members can be modified in order to create a suitable combination of torsional stability and longitudinal flexibility (col. 7, lines 28-39). One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to seek ways in which stents with similar strut motifs are interconnected. Fischell et al. disclose a way, which one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize, that allows w-shaped elements to be interconnected by shorter length tie members. Fischell et al. disclose that this interconnection pattern provides increased longitudinal flexibility and relies on omitting interconnections between the shortest lobes (col. 3, lines 17-29). The modification proposed by Examiner omits the interconnection between the shortest lobes and places it onto the longer, outer lobes of the w-shaped elements of Dang (keeping Dang's preference for only interconnecting w-shaped elements which open towards eachother). Applicant has argued that there are many ways to make this modification other than what Examiner has proposed but these alternate forms of the modification result in a non-uniform spacing between tie members in a circumferential direction (as shown in Applicant's drawings). Neither Dang nor Fischell et al. disclose this non-uniformity. The passage from Dang cited by Applicant (col. 5, lines 20-29) actually confirms that it is not critical for the central lobe to be connected since Dang discloses that it is only preferred. Dang discloses several optional features as 'preferred' such as the stent being preferably balloon expandable.